

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JUSTIN MEADE,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	No. 1:21-cv-6
v.)	
)	Honorable Paul L. Maloney
KENNETH J. BOONE, and)	
BRANDON CHARLES CARR,)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT & RECOMMENDATION

This matter was referred to the Honorable Phillip Green, United States Magistrate Judge, who issued a Report & Recommendation (R&R) on November 4, 2021 (ECF No. 58). The R&R recommends that this Court enter default against Defendants Boone and Carr.¹ The parties were given fourteen days to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations per 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2), and Defendant Boone filed an untimely objection (ECF No. 59). Because Defendant Boone fails to raise a cognizable objection to the R&R, the Court will adopt the R&R over Boone's objection.

After being served with a report and recommendation issued by a magistrate judge, a party has fourteen days to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). A district court judge reviews de novo the portions of the R&R to which objections have been filed. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Only objections that are specific are entitled to a de novo review under

¹ Default has already been entered against the other defendants in this matter, Boone & Associates Group LLC, Diversified Debt Recovery LLC, and National Debt Assistance (*see* ECF No. 30).

the statute. *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986) (per curiam). “[A]n objection that does nothing more than state a disagreement with the magistrate’s suggested resolution, or simply summarizes what has been presented before, is not an ‘objection’ as that term is used in the context of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72.” *Brown v. City of Grand Rapids*, No. 16-2433, 2017 WL 4712064, at *2 (6th Cir. June 16, 2017).

This Court conducted a de novo review. On review of the record, the R&R is adopted over Boone’s objection. Boone has filed an untimely document where he vaguely alleges that he is under duress, that the judges in this district are conspiring against him, and that he wants to “face [his] accuser in court” (ECF No. 59 at PageID.468). These statements are nonsensical and are not specific objections that warrant de novo review. While Boone ironically wishes he could “face [his] accuser,” the Court gave him ample opportunities to do so, and he failed to appear (see ECF No. 58 at PageID.460, 463). Boone’s “objections,” are thus overruled.

Given that there are no errors in the magistrate judge’s analysis, the Court will adopt the R&R and enter default against Defendants Boone and Carr. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 58) as the Opinion of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Court issues an entry of default against Defendants Boone and Carr.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff may petition the Court for reasonable costs related to Plaintiff’s counsel’s appearance at the hearings on September 9, September 27, and

October 19, 2021.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: December 7, 2021

/s/ Paul L. Maloney

Paul L. Maloney

United States District Judge